

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were pending in this application. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 10, and 19 are amended. Amendment of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented. No new matter is added.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the telephonic interview conducted April 6, 2011. In attendance was Examiner Stork and Applicants' representative Benno Guggenheimer. During the interview, claim 1 was discussed with respect to the current rejection. Specifically, the Examiner proposed amending claim 1 to clarify that the device-information-based layout tree is provided to the rendering unit of the information browser without creating an html document. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would overcome the cited art.

The following response and amendments are in accordance with the substance of the interview.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry et al. (EP 1286260, hereafter Henry) and further in view of Beranek et al. (GB 2329309, hereafter Beranek).

Applicants submit that the references fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 1, as amended. Relevant portions of claim 1, as amended, recite:

- a device information provider comprising:
 - an acquisition unit which acquires the device internal information of the one or more information devices;
 - a generation unit which generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information; and
 - a providing unit which provides the generated device-information-based layout tree to the rendering unit of the information browser without creating an html document,

(Emphasis added.) Support for the amendment can be found in, for example, paragraphs [0011], [0044], and Fig. 1 of the specification.

Henry and Beranek, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, as amended. In general, Henry describes a computer network for communicating with an audio video device (e.g., VCR) over the Internet. In Henry, a device (Fig. 2, item 21, VCR device) communicates with a first PC (Fig. 2, item 22) using a 1394 serial bus protocol. The first PC receives data from the (VCR) device and generates a web page that can be displayed on the web browser of a second PC (Fig. 2, item 24). (Henry at [0031].) The web page is communicated to the second PC (Fig. 2, item 24) using an Internet/web protocol. (Henry at [0031].) Assuming for the sake of argument that the data from the (VCR) device can be considered device internal information, Henry requires that device data be converted to a web page (html format) before it can be communicated and displayed on the second, remote PC. Thus, Henry does not disclose or suggest, “a generation unit which generates a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information.” (Emphasis added.) Furthermore, Henry does not disclose or suggest, “a providing unit which provides the generated device-information-based layout tree to the rendering unit of the information browser without creating an html document.” (Emphasis added.)

These deficiencies are not remedied by Beranek. Relevant portions of Beranek describe a proxy server for intercepting an html Web document and reformatting the document's content to alter the “look and feel” of displayed content. (Beranek at 6:8-7:4.) Beranek does not display any information analogous to device internal information, and therefore has no need to generate a “device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information,” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Beranek is configured as a proxy server that reformats an html document. Therefore, implicit in the reformatting operation of Beranek is the *a priori* creation of an html document. Thus, Beranek also does not create ““a providing unit which provides the generated device-information-based layout tree to the rendering unit of the information browser without creating an html document,” as recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added.).

Thus, Henry and Beranek, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1, as amended. For at least these reasons the references fail to render claim 1 obvious. Independent claims 10 and 19 also recite the generation of “a device-information-based layout tree containing layout information of the device internal information” and providing the

device-information-based layout tree to be rendered on a display “without creating an html document.” Claims 10 and 19 are also not obvious for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-19 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **448252001600**. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Peter J. Yim

Registration No.: 44,417
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105-2482
(415) 268-6373